arXiv:1402.3979v2 [hep-ph] 17 Mar 2015

Bajc-Melfo Vacua enable Yukawon ultraminimal grand unified theories

Charanjit S. Aulakh*[1]

[1]*Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Mohali, Sector 81, S. A. S. Nagar, Manauli PO 140306, India*

(Dated: March 18, 2015)

Abstract

Bajc-Melfo(**BM**) two field (S, ϕ) superpotentials define metastable F-term supersymmetry breaking vacua suitable as hidden sectors for calculable and realistic family and Grand Unification unification models. The undetermined vev $< S_s >$ of the Polonyi field that breaks Supersymmetry can be fixed either by coupling to N=1 Supergravity or by radiative corrections. **BM** hidden sectors extend to symmetric multiplets $(S, \phi)_{ab}$ of a gauged $O(N_g)$ family symmetry, broken at the GUT scale, so that the $O(N_g)$ charged component vevs $< \hat{S}_{ab} >$ are also undetermined before accounting for the $O(N_g)$ D-terms: which fix them by cancellation against D-term contributions from the visible sector. This facilitates Yukawon Ultra Minimal GUTs(YUMGUTs) proposed in [C.S.Aulakh and C.K.Khosa, Phys.Rev.D 90,045008(2014)] by relieving the visible sector from the need to give null D-terms for the family symmetry $O(N_g)$. We analyze symmetry breaking and and spectra of the hidden sector fields in the Supergravity resolved case when $N_g = 1, 2, 3$. Besides the Polonyi field S_s, most of the superfields $\hat{S}_{ab}$ remain light, with fermions getting masses only from loop corrections. Such modes may yield novel dark matter lighter than 100 GeV. Possible Polonyi and moduli problems associated with the the fields S_{ab} call for detailed investigation of loop effects due to the Yukawa and gauge interactions in the hidden sector and of post-inflationary field relaxation dynamics.

* aulakh@pu.ac.in; aulakh@iisermohali.ac.in; http://14.139.227.202/Faculty/aulakh/

I. INTRODUCTION

Supersymmetry imposes remarkable restrictions on its own spontaneous violation and thus severely constrains models of BSM physics. Traditionally[1–5] gravity mediation has been used to generate phenomenologically acceptable soft Susy breaking terms for globally supersymmetric GUTs. This requires supersymmetry breaking in a hidden sector with no superpotential couplings to the 'visible' sector in which we live. The GUT Minkowski space vacuum is metastable[4] in the sense of there being a Susy preserving vacuum with lower (negative) energy, but it is thought that it cannot decay to the lower vacuum by tunnelling; or at any rate the timescale for doing so is much larger than the age of the universe. The vacuum in the gravity mediated scenario is defined as the perturbation of a Global Susy preserving minimum by a hidden sector with a *global* minimum which breaks supersymmetry spontaneously due to specialized superpotentials(Polonyi,O'Raifeartaigh [6, 7] etc) or due to strong dynamics(gaugino condensation etc). After long struggles to tame the hard problem of finding phenomenologically usable Susy breaking global minima it was re-emphasized[8, 9] that metastable i.e local minima could serve just as well as global minima, since the unifying theory would anyway have vacua at lower energy[4] than the phenomenologically relevant Minkowski vacuum on which the MSSM lived. This realization was liberating for phenomenologists because models defined on supersymmetry breaking vacua which are only local minima offer a much larger range of candidate vacua. Various strongly coupled supersymmetric gauge theories [9, 10]were studied to provide the Susy breaking dynamics albeit now considering also metastable vacua. Unfortunately even the metastable dynamical Susy breaking models seem so arbitrarily elaborate as to rival the complexity of the phenomenological theory (GUT,MSSM etc) for which they were supposedly to provide the service of Supersymmetry breaking: making testability of both a moot issue.

Recently Bajc and Melfo (BM)[11] suggested that, from a 'calculable unification' viewpoint, it would be more interesting to consider Susy breaking metastable vacua of simple two field hidden sector superpotentials. BM models are related to the classic O'Raifeartaigh susy breaking superpotentials and are variants of a class of models with susy breaking local minima studied systematically earlier in [12]. Such superpotentials typically have flat directions and there is a longstanding vision whereby the determination of such flat directions(running out of susy breaking minima) by radiative corrections[13] or supergravity[14, 15] might prof-

itably fix the undetermined vacuum expectation values(VEVs) at a high Unification scale. Bajc and Melfo took up this challenge and formulated models where the undetermined VEVs were those of **24** or **75** irreps of an $SU(5)$ unified theory and the flat directions were determined by radiative corrections. The use of of N=1 Supergravity potentials to lift the flat directions rolling out of the Bajc-Melfo Susy breaking local minimum has not been analyzed.

From a Grand Unified viewpoint the only credible sign of flavour unification so far so far is third family Yukawa unification at large $\tan\beta$ in SO(10) at scales of order $M_X > 10^{16}$ GeV. On the other hand minimal Supersymmetric SO(10) GUTs[16–23] have been shown to be completely realistic and even to suppress $d = 5$ proton decay[24, 25] by a novel and generic mechanism based on the necessary emergence of a pair of light doublet Higgs in the effective MSSM. Motivated by these two clues we exploited the defining(i.e $\overline{\mathbf{126}}$) representation of MSGUTs(which gets large vevs yet couples to matter fermions) to design a *renormalizable* Grand Unified Yukawon/familion model[26] in which we generate hierarchical matter fermion Yukawas from flavour bland parameters of the MSGUT extended by an $O(N_g)$ family symmetry. Family gauge symmetry is broken at the unification scale and the visible sector GUT Higgs fields effloresce into symmetric ($\mathbf{210}, \mathbf{126}, \overline{\mathbf{126}}, \mathbf{10}$) or anti-symmetric ($\mathbf{120}$) irreps of the family group (as dictated by the properties of bilinears in the **16**-plet matter irreps in SO(10) GUTs), while the matter **16-**plet Yukawa couplings become flavour bland. The neat and exactly soluble[18] gauge symmetry breaking ($SO(10) \rightarrow$ MSSM) of the family singlet MSGUT Higgs system then generalizes straightforwardly for the family symmetry variant MSGUT Higgs multiplets. The supersymmetric breaking of family symmetry will be discussed in detail in this paper. Extraction of the light MSSM Higgs from the plethora of MSSM doublets present in the $O(N_g) \times SO(10)$ GUT via calculation of the 'Higgs fractions'[18, 20, 23, 27] (which specify the make up of the MSSM Higgs) determined by flavour blind GUT parameters generates candidate flavour structures.

In implementing this flavour generation scenario an obstacle arises. Although the solution of the F and D term conditions for the GUT multiplets in the SO(10) sector with flavour non-diagonal VEVs is straightforward, it is very hard or impossible to ensure that the same configurations simultaneously cancel the family symmetry D-terms. It thus becomes necessary to introduce additional fields to soak up the the contribution of the GUT VEVs to the $O(N_g)$ D terms. Since minimality, simplicity and solubility of the GUT Higgs sector symmetry breaking is a central virtue of MSGUTs it is natural to ask whether the additional

fields might not be located in a hidden sector with its own flat directions arising from supersymmetry breaking in a way which did not interfere with the already accomplished MSGUT symmetry breaking[16–18]. Besides making a completely unexpected connection between family symmetry and supersymmetry breaking this idea is straightforward to implement in a context where the BM flat directions are lifted by a combination of supergravity and $O(N_g)$ gauge D term minimization effects.

A notable phenomenological implication of our model is the presence of weakly coupled light fields('moduli'). In particular, in the supergravity mediated scenario presented here there is a Polonyi (scalar) field (Planck scale vev, weak scale mass and intermediate scale susy breaking F-term). In addition there are other light fermions and scalars associated with the flat directions of the family non singlet BM fields. These modes may be interesting light(< 50 GeV) Susy WIMP dark matter of the sort perhaps indicated by the DAMA/LIBRA experiment [28] and so far completely missing from MSGUT spectra. On the other hand this clutch of modes may also pose the typical problems associated with 'moduli' fields found in other fundamental theories[29]. Recall that the Polonyi problem arises due to late decay of the oscillations of the supersymmetry breaking Polonyi field while it settles into the zero temperature potential's minimum because of the suppression of its couplings by the Planck scale. The dark matter candidates' role in cosmogony also needs to be checked for consistency. In view of the new Yukawa and gauge interactions of the hidden sector the cosmological implications require a separate detailed study and thus should not prematurely prejudice the novel flavour generation aspects of our model. In this paper we give the relevant details for the symmetry breaking, VEVs and masses in the BM sector for direct use in our 'yukawonification' [26] models. We will return to a study of cosmological constraints and alternative models elsewhere.

II. THE BAJC MELFO VACUA AND SUPERGRAVITY

The Bajc-Melfo superpotential[11] is a quadratic variant of of the the O'Raifeartaigh superpotential and its relatives [7, 12] which breaks superymmetry at a *metastable* minimum

$$W_{BM}(S_s, \phi_s) = W_0 + S_s(\mu_B \phi_s + \lambda_B \phi_s^2) \tag{1}$$

We have added a constant term W_0 for later convenience. It is then easy to see[11, 12]

that besides the Susy preserving global minima at $S_s = \phi_s = 0$ and $S_s = 0, \phi_s = -\mu_B/\lambda_B$ with zero vacuum energy, there is also a local minimum at $< \phi_s >= -\mu_B/2\lambda_B$ with $< S_s >$ undetermined provided

$$| < S_s > | \geq | \frac{< \phi_s >}{\sqrt{2}} | \tag{2}$$

This local minimum breaks supersymmetry since $< F_S >= -\mu_B^2/4\lambda_B \equiv \theta$. Thus the chiral fermion in the multiplet S_s provides the goldstino field while its partner scalar, whose VEV remains undetermined, is massless. When supersymmetry is made local by coupling the theory to gravity the goldstino can be gauged away by a local supersymmetry transformation leaving a massive gravitino while the scalar picks up the gravitino mass common to light scalars in gravity mediation. For clarity we first review the effect of coupling to supergravity on extrema of globally supersymmetric Lagrangians[4].

The generic $N = 1$ supergravity potential[1, 3, 5] for scalar fields z_I interacting through a superpotential $W(z_I)$ (with canonical Kahler potential $K(z, \bar{z})$ and gauge Kinetic function $f_{\alpha\beta}(z) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$, κ is the Planck Length)

$$\begin{aligned} V &= E(\sum_I |\mathcal{F}^I|^2 - 3\kappa^2|W|^2) + \sum_\alpha \frac{g_\alpha^2}{4}\left[\frac{(\mathcal{F}^I(T^\alpha)_I^J z_J)^2}{\kappa^4 W^2} + h.c.\right] \\ \mathcal{F}^I &= \frac{\partial W}{\partial z_I} + z^{*I}\kappa^2 W \qquad ; \qquad E \equiv e^{\kappa^2 \sum_I |z_I|^2} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

As is well known, the constant term in the superpotential W, which is irrelevant in global supersymmetry, can be used to tune the vacuum energy in *one* of its extrema to zero after coupling to Supergravity. This means that for a supersymmetric minimum with vevs $< z_I >= \bar{z}_I$ derived from

$$< F^I >=< \partial W/\partial z_I >= 0 \quad ; \quad < D^\alpha >=< z^{*I} T_I^{\alpha J} z_J >= 0 \tag{4}$$

there is no shift in the global vevs $< \bar{z}_I >$ at all: since by tuning $< W >= \overline{W} = 0$ we ensure that the vev $\overline{\mathcal{F}}^I = \overline{F}^I = 0$, the vacuum energy at the old minimum vanishes and so do terms in the extremization condition which come from the variations of the fields in the exponential factor (since they multiply a separately vanishing factor). It is however amusing that the D-term vev in (3) above is then indeterminate : seemingly indicating and incompatibility between Supergravity and preserved supersymmetry with$< W >= 0$!

On the other hand if the global superpotential breaks supersymmetry spontaneously(as for example, the Polonyi or O'Raifeartaigh superpotentials at a global minimum or the BM

superpotential at a local minimum), then the non vanishing of F at the minimum means that the total superpotential vev must be nonzero to cancel the global contribution to the vacuum energy in eqn(3). The vevs of the supersymmetry preserving visible sector fields may also shift from their globally determined values by small terms of order $O(m_{3/2})$ and maintain zero value for their local F-terms. Special behaviour is seen only for the components of the sliding multiplet S which breaks supersymmetry.

Using the potential (3) in the pure BM case we see that the field S_s whose value was *undetermined* at the local/metastable minimum of the global superpotential described above now picks up a potential which fixes its value to be of order the Planck scale. The other BM field ϕ_s which already had a large vev (think of it as $\bar{\phi}_s \sim 10^{12}$ GeV on phenomenological grounds in the context of the gravity mediated(SUGRY) models we are developing) will only experience a tiny shift in its vev. To leading order we can determine the vev $< S_s > \equiv \bar{S}_s$ by fixing ϕ_s at its globally determined value $\bar{\phi}_s = -\mu_B/2\lambda_B$. The potential to be minimized is then

$$V(S_s) = e^{\kappa^2|S_s|^2+\delta}\{(\delta\kappa^2|W_0 + S_s\theta|^2 + |\theta + \kappa^2 S_s^*(W_0 + S_s\theta)|^2 - 3\kappa^2|W_0 + S_s\theta|^2\} \qquad (5)$$

Here $\delta = \kappa^2(|\bar{\phi}_s|^2)$ is a tiny background fixed *parameter* ($\sim 10^{-12}$) for the purposes of the extremization w.r.t. the globally undetermined vev of S_s and has essentially no effect on the value of S_s at the extremum found. Defining dimension less variables

$$\begin{aligned} x &= \kappa\frac{\widehat{W_0}}{\theta} \quad ; \qquad y = \kappa S_s \\ \varphi_x &= Arg[x] \quad ; \qquad \varphi_y = Arg[y] \end{aligned} \qquad (6)$$

the potential becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{V} \equiv \frac{V}{|\theta|^2} = \big\{&(|x|^2 + |y|^2)(\delta - 3) + (1 + |y|^2)^2 + \\ &|x|^2|y|^2 + 2\cos(\varphi_y - \varphi_x)|x||y|(|y|^2 + \delta - 2)\big\} \end{aligned} \qquad (7)$$

We emphasize that x (which is the dimensionless form of the constant term in the superpotential) is not a dynamical variable but a parameter to be tuned to maintain the Minkowski Vacuum energy at zero. Similarly δ is a parameter fixed by the globally determined background to the S_s extremization at a lower order of the expansion in powers of κ and not a variable.

The only stable minimum of (7) with respect to y (i.e S_s) with zero energy i.e for(field subscripts denote partial derivatives) :

$$V = V_{|y|} = V_{\theta_y} = 0 = V_{|y|,\theta_y} \qquad ; \qquad V_{|y|,|y|}, V_{\theta_y\theta_y} > 0 \tag{8}$$

is achieved as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_y &= \varphi_x \quad ; \qquad x = 2 - \sqrt{3-\delta} \quad ; \qquad y = y_0 = \sqrt{3-\delta} - 1 \\ \overline{\partial_{|y|}\partial_{|y|}\tilde{V}} &= 4\sqrt{3-\delta} \quad ; \qquad \overline{\partial_{\varphi_y}\partial_{\varphi_y}\tilde{V}} = 4\delta\sqrt{3-\delta} - 16\delta - 32\sqrt{3-\delta} + 56 \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

It is clear that the condition for a local minimum (2) is satisfied for

$$\delta < 3 - (1 + \sqrt{|\frac{\kappa^2\theta}{2\lambda_B}|})^2 \simeq 2 \tag{10}$$

As mentioned δ is tiny and this condition is trivially satisfied. Thus we have fixed the leading contribution $\bar{S}_s$ at the Planck scale by the combination of a gravitino scale ($m_{3/2} = \kappa^2 < W >$) mass and a tiny ($\sim (m_{3/2}/M_{Planck})^2$) quartic coupling for the sliding field S_s. The leading order vevs $\bar{\phi}_s, \bar{S}_s$ specify a Minkowski vacuum, with the degeneracy in S_s lifted, to leading order in $\kappa\bar{\phi}_s \sim 10^{-13}$. There is no immediate reason to compute next order shifts by perturbing around these vevs, but it is straightforward to do so iteratively.

We now wish to build upon these complementary simple cases to first analyze a model in which a hidden sector BM superpotential $W_{BM}(S_s, \phi_s) = W_H$ with gauge singlets is coupled to a visible(GUT) sector with(fields z_i) which has a globally supersymmetric minimum associated with superpotential $W_O(z_i)$ and is invariant under a grand unifying gauge group broken spontaneously by the vevs $\bar{z}_i$ at a superheavy scale ($M_G \sim 10^{16}$ GeV) while preserving Susy[20, 23, 26]. There is no coupling between the fields of the two sectors in the superpotential. So their global extrema and the non determination of $\bar{S}_s$ are unchanged. It is eminently reasonable to pursue the determination of the leading correction by setting fields ϕ, z_i already determined at the global level to those values $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{z}_i)$ and determine the undetermined field i.e S_s by minimizing (3) with respect to S_s, tuning W_0 to maintain zero energy at the vacuum. In this case the entire discussion goes through verbatim with two superficial modifications :

1. The constant term in the superpotential now also receives a contribution from the vev of the visible sector i.e $W_O(\bar{z}_i)$.

2. The tiny background determined parameter δ now also contains the visible sector values :

$$\delta \;=\; \kappa^2(|\bar{\phi}_s|^2 + \sum_i |\bar{z}_i|^2) \tag{11}$$

Thus the determination of S_s is unchanged. The value of δ is still very small since $M_{GUT} << M_{Planck}$, $\delta < 10^{-6}$. Condition (10) is still obviously trivially satisfied.

Finally we arrive at the novel construction proposed in[26] where a (family) gauge symmetry links the BM hidden sector to the visible sector,via the D terms, even at the global level but there is still no link at the level of the superpotential. As we will see in the following sections besides the field S_s also the gauge non-singlet parts $\hat{S}$ of the sliding field remain undetermined by the global F-term conditions. *However* the visible sector contributions to the family gauge group D terms *will not*[26] vanish. In the BM sector vevs of the family non singlet part of ϕ field have zero vev so that ϕ makes no contribution to the family $D-$terms. While the undetermined $\hat{S}$ non-singlet BM vevs will contribute to the- positive definite- family group D terms. Since the visible contribution is $\sim M_{GUT}^4$, it is obviously highly favorable for the $\hat{S}$ fields to take vevs and cancel this positive definite contribution to the global susy potential. For definiteness let the Family gauge group be the $O(N_g), N_g = 2, 3$ actually used in [26] (for cogent structural and phenomenological reasons). Then an $O(N_g)$ gauge transformation can always align the family D-term vev with any one generator of the gauge group and thus requires (in that aligned basis) only one $\hat{S}$ component to get a vev. It is clear that there will be a pseudo-goldstone degeneracy among the the remaining $\hat{S}$ fields which may be lifted by Supergravity effects. Since field $\hat{S}$ gets a vev $\bar{\hat{S}} << M_{Planck}$ it too affects the S_s vev (like $\bar{\phi}_s, \bar{z}_i$) only very weakly through δ which now takes the value

$$\delta \;=\; \kappa^2(|\bar{\phi}_s|^2 + \sum_i |\bar{z}_i|^2 + Tr\bar{\hat{S}}^\dagger\bar{\hat{S}}) \tag{12}$$

and the rest of the determination of the BM-Polonyi field S_s goes through unchanged.

As usual in gravity mediated scenarios, the chiral fermion in the local supersymmetry breaking S multiplet is the global Susy breaking Goldstino that furnishes the longitudinal mode of the gravitino which gets the mass

$$m_{\frac{3}{2}} \;=\; \kappa^2|\sqrt{\bar{E}}(W_0 + W_O(\bar{z}_i) + \overline{W_H})| \tag{13}$$

Since this mass should be $\sim 10^3 - 10^5$ GeV in typical gravity mediated scenarios and typically $\overline{W}_{GUT} \sim M_X^3 > 10^{48}$ GeV, it is clear that W_0 must be used to cancel $\overline{W}_{GUT}$ so that

$$| < W > | \simeq M_p|\theta| \simeq 10^{39} - 10^{41} GeV^3 \tag{14}$$

The scale of supersymmetry breaking is fixed by the BM superpotential parameters :

$$\sqrt{|F^S|} \; = \; \sqrt{|\theta|} = |\frac{\mu_B}{2\sqrt{\lambda_B}}| \sim 10^{10.5} - 10^{11.5}\text{GeV} \tag{15}$$

Provided $|\lambda_B| > 10^{-14}$ one has $|\lambda_B S| >> |\mu_B|$.

Having discussed the case $N_g = 1$ in this section and indicated the general structure and solution strategy for our model[26], where family gauge symmetry - but not superpotential couplings - tie the visible and hidden sectors together, we will discuss the details of the global superpotentials and family representations in the next section for $N_g = 2, 3$ while the moduli mass spectra associated with the $\hat{S}$ "familion moduli" are discussed in Section 4.

A slightly subtle point that follows from the role of $\mathcal{F}$ as a local supersymmetry order parameter is that z_i, ϕ_s get small corrections of order $m_{3/2}$ so as to maintain $\mathcal{F}_{z_i,\phi_s} \equiv 0$ and similarly the family gauge non singlet BM fields $\hat{\phi}$ remain zero (see the next section) so that $\mathcal{F}_{\hat{\phi}} \equiv 0$. However since $\bar{S}_s \sim M_{Planck}, \bar{\hat{S}} \sim M_{GUT}$ while $\overline{W} \neq 0$, it is clear that $\mathcal{F}_{S_s,\hat{S}}$ are not zero but $\mathcal{F}_{\hat{S}}/\mathcal{F}_{S_s} \sim M_{GUT}/M_{Planck} << 1$, so that S_s still dominates the supersymmetry breaking.

III. GAUGED $O(N_g)$ AND BM VACUA

Assuming that the visible sector supersymmetry conditions are satisfied the vanishing of the *family symmetry* D terms for the GUT sector VEVs($\bar{z}_i$) alone is by no means guaranteed. In global susy the $O(N_g)$ D terms have the form

$$\begin{aligned} D^a_{O(N_g)} \; &= \; Tr(\hat{\phi}^\dagger[T^a, \hat{\phi}] + \hat{S}^\dagger[T^a, \hat{S}]) + \overline{D}^a_X \\ \bar{D}^a_X \; &= \; \sum_i \bar{z}_i^\dagger \mathcal{T}^a \bar{z}_i \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where $\overline{D}^a_X$ is the contribution of the visible sector fields, and $T^a, \mathcal{T}^a$ the generators of $O(N_g)$ in the fundamental and generic representations.

Since we wish to use a flat direction of the hidden sector superpotential to cancel the contribution $\overline{D^a_X}$ of the visible sector we consider the situation where ϕ_s, S_s become the trace

modes of $O(N_g)$ symmetric representations ϕ_{ab}, S_{ab} so that the BM superpotential becomes

$$W_H \ = \ TrS(\mu_B\phi + \sqrt{N_g}\lambda_B\phi^2) \tag{17}$$

Generically

$$S \ = \ \widehat{S} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_g}}S_s\,\mathcal{I}_{N_g} \qquad ; \qquad Tr\hat{S} = 0 \tag{18}$$

$\mathcal{I}_{N_g}$ is the N_g dimensional unit matrix.

Before performing the case-wise analysis consider the general features of the minimization of the Bajc-Melfo potential arising from the hidden sector potential W_H alone when $N_g > 1$. The BM local minimum we find is characterized by an indeterminate VEV of all the fields $S_s, \hat{S}$ in the symmetric multiplet S while the VEV of ϕ is fixed. The arguments given above and the evaluations in the next section show that the VEV of the family singlet in S is determined by Supergravity effects while the others are fixed by minimizing the family D-terms(which are of $O(M_{GUT}^4)$) together with the leading corrections to them namely the Supergravity induced soft mass terms ($O(m_{3/2}^2M_{GUT}^2)$: all of which starts from considering the BM local supersymmetry breaking minimum and its flat direction for $N_g > 1$ together with the globally supersymmetric vevs $\bar{z}_i$ as the background in which the determination of the sliding multiplet vevs $S_s, \hat{S}$ are determined. We built up the argument for this fixation stepwise in Section 2 and the novelty is now only the determination of the $\hat{S}$ vevs.

The F-terms arising from N_g are

$$\begin{aligned} F_\phi \ &= \ \mu_B S + \lambda\sqrt{N_g}(S.\phi + \phi.S) \\ F_S \ &= \ \mu_B\phi + \lambda\sqrt{N_g}\phi.\phi \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Clearly the associated global superpotential

$$V(\phi, S) \ = \ Tr(F_S^\dagger F_S + F_\phi^\dagger.F_\phi) \tag{20}$$

is semipositive definite. We search for the generalization of the BM local minimum by the ansatz

$$< \phi >= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_g}}\bar{\phi}_s\mathcal{I}_{N_g} \tag{21}$$

We emphasize that this implies that the gauge non singlet vev $\hat{\phi} \equiv 0$ for all N_g. In fact this feature implies that after the introduction of supergravity corrections $\mathcal{F}_{\hat{\phi}} = 0$ (unlike $\mathcal{F}_{\hat{S}}$ which develops a value $O(m_{3/2}M_{GUT})$ and thus makes a M_{GUT}/M_{Planck} suppressed

contribution to the goldstino). With the ansatz (21) Then

$$\begin{aligned} < F_\phi > &= < S > (\mu_B + 2\lambda\bar{\phi}_s) \\ < F_S > &= < \bar{\phi}_s > (\mu_B + \lambda\bar{\phi}_s)\mathcal{I}_{N_g} \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

so that $\phi_s = -\mu_B/(2\lambda)$ still ensures that $< F_\phi >, < F_{\hat{S}} >$ vanish provided $< \phi >$ has the form in (21). Moreover the fluctuation $\tilde{\phi}$ around this VEV receives a positive definite mass squared

$$V = 4|\lambda < S_s > |^2 \, Tr\, \tilde{\phi}^\dagger \tilde{\phi} + ... \tag{23}$$

from the VEV of the singlet in S_s which is undetermined by the BM potential but fixed by Supergravity corrections to be be of order M_p as shown above. These contributions dominate all others. On the other hand

$$< F_S >= -\frac{\mu_B^2}{4\lambda}\mathcal{I}_{N_g} \tag{24}$$

breaks supersymmetry and causes corrections of order $\pm\mu_B^2$ to the scalar masses of the ϕ supermultiplet. We again emphasize that the F term of $\hat{S}$ vanishes for the BM minimum for all N_g. The mass spectrum is discussed in detail in Section 4.

A. Determination of $S_\pm$ when $N_g = 2$

For $N_g = 2$ it is convenient to use the isomorphism $O(2) \simeq U(1)$ and define

$$S \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}S_s + S_+ + S_- & i(S_- - S_+) \\ i(S_- - S_+) & \sqrt{2}S_s - (S_+ + S_-) \end{pmatrix} \tag{25}$$

and similarly for $\phi = [\phi_{ab}]$ where $S_\pm, S_s$ are properly normalized fields so that $TrS^\dagger S = S_+^\dagger S_+ + S_-^\dagger S_- + S_s^\dagger S_s$ and $TrS\phi = S_s\phi_s + S_{(+}\phi_{-)}$. In this notation an $O(2)$ vector ψ_a has charges $\pm 1/2 : \psi_{\pm 1/2} = (\psi_1 \pm i\psi_2)/\sqrt{2}$. The superpotential becomes

$$W_H \;=\; \mu_B(S_s\phi_s + S_{(+}\phi_{-)}) + \lambda_B(S_s\phi_s^2 + 2S_s\phi_+\phi_- + 2\phi_s S_{(+}\phi_{-)}) \tag{26}$$

and it is easy to check that $\bar{\phi}_s = -\mu_B/2\lambda_B, \bar{\phi}_\pm = 0$ solves the F-term conditions for W_H (all F -terms vanish except that $\overline{\partial_{S_s} W} = \theta$ as before). This verifies that the general form of the the vevs of ϕ, F_S is indeed that given in (21,22). The fields $S_{s,\pm}$ remain undetermined

at this local minimum and the superpotential reduces to the one for $N_g = 1$ when the fields that *are* determined are equated to their values at the local minimum. Notice that the vev $\bar{\phi}$ makes the coefficient of $S_{(+}\phi_{-)}$ *vanish* so that there is no Dirac mass mixing the chiral fermions in $S_{\pm}, \phi_{\mp}$.

The calculation for the singlet goes through unchanged fixing $S_s \sim M_p$ as in eqns.(21,22). With this VEV the $O(2)$ charged fermionic components of $\hat{\phi}_{\pm}$ get masses $\sim \lambda_B \bar{S}_s$. Along with the GUT scale breaking of the family symmetry the large mass of the modes in ϕ_{ab} is responsible for quelling the percolation of the supersymmetry breaking coded in F_{S_s} and ensuring the hidden sector is actually hidden. Since $\hat{\phi}_{\pm}$ have zero VEVs at the Susy breaking minimum they do not mix with the family symmetry gaugino. Since the charged S fields can have VEVs of at most the order of the GUT scale $M_{GUT} << M_P$ the potential for their determination to leading order in $m_{3/2}$ is simply the common scalar mass term generated by the Supergravity potential and the D term of the family symmetry. In the O(2) case the leading order potential for the flat family charged S directions is

$$V(S_+, S_-) \; = \; m_{3/2}^2(|S_+|^2 + |S_-|^2) + \frac{g_f^2}{2}(|S_+|^2 - |S_-|^2 + \bar{D}_X)^2 \tag{27}$$

here $\bar{D}_X = \sum q_i |\bar{z}_i|^2$ where $q_i, \bar{z}_i$ are the family symmetry charges of the global supersymmetric VEVs in the visible sector. Clearly, if $x = Sign[D_X]$ the minimum will occur when

$$S_{-x} \; = \; \sqrt{|\bar{D}_X| - x\frac{m_{3/2}^2}{g^2}} \qquad ; \qquad \bar{S}_x = 0 \tag{28}$$

Notice that the shift in the S_{-x} VEV relative to $\sqrt{\bar{D}_X}$ is tiny but the gravity induced mass term does enforce the choice of which component of $\hat{S}$ gets a VEV. The vacuum energy after minimization is $\sim m_{3/2}^2 |D_X|$ and can be tuned to zero by a shift $\delta \hat{W}_0 \sim m_{3/2}|D_X| < m_{3/2} M_p^2$. Note that since $\bar{F}_{\hat{S}} = 0$ from (26)(and $\bar{F}_{z_i} = 0$ by our scenario) the supergravity corrections to the global D-terms shown in (3) are zero.

B. Fixation of S VEVs for $N_g = 3$

For $N_g = 3$ we define the components of S_{ab} in terms of T_3 eigenfields to be

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{6}\left(\sqrt{6}S_0 + 3iS_{-2} - 3iS_{+2} + 2\sqrt{3}S_s\right) & \frac{1}{2}(S_{+2} + S_{-2}) & \frac{1}{2}(S_+ + S_-) \\ \frac{1}{2}(S_{-2} + S_{+2}) & \frac{1}{6}\left(\sqrt{6}S_0 - 3iS_{-2} + 3iS_{+2} + 2\sqrt{3}S_s\right) & \frac{1}{2}i(S_+ - S_-) \\ \frac{1}{2}(S_+ + S_-) & \frac{1}{2}i(S_+ - S_-) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(S_s - \sqrt{2}S_0) \end{pmatrix}$$

and similarly for $\phi = [\phi_{ab}]$. $S_{s,0,\pm,\pm 2}$ are properly normalized fields so that

$$\begin{aligned} TrS^\dagger S &= S^\dagger_{+2}S_{+2} + S^\dagger_{-2}S_{-2} + S^\dagger_{+}S_{+} + S^\dagger_{-}S_{-} + S^\dagger_{s}S_{s} \\ TrS\phi &= S_s\phi_s + S_{(+}\phi_{-)} + S_{(+2}\phi_{-2)} \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

In this case the explicit form of the BM superpotential is((square)round brackets denote(anti-)symmetrization)

$$\begin{aligned} W_{BM} &= \mu_B(S_s\phi_s + S_0\phi_0 + S_{(+}\phi_{-)} + S_{(+2}\phi_{-2)}) \\ &\quad +\lambda_B\big[(S_s(\phi_s^2 + \phi_0^2 + 2\phi_-\phi_+ + 2\phi_{-2}\phi_{+2}) \\ &\quad +S_0(-\phi_0^2/\sqrt{2} + 2\phi_s\phi_0 - \sqrt{2}\phi_-\phi_+ + \sqrt{2}\phi_{-2}\phi_{+2}) \\ &\quad +2S_{(+}\phi_{-)}\phi_s - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}S_{(+}\phi_{-)}\phi_0 + i\sqrt{3}(S_+\phi_{-2}\phi_+ - S_-\phi_-\phi_{+2}) \\ &\quad +\sqrt{2}S_{(+2}\phi_{-2)}\phi_0 + 2S_{(+2}\phi_{-2)}\phi_s + \frac{i}{2}S_{[+2}\phi^2_{-2]}\big] \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Using this one may again verify that the vevs are of the form given in eqns.(21,22).

When $N_g = 3$ the D-terms form a vector of $O(3)$ and it is advantageous to change to a basis(denoted by primes) where $\bar{D}'^a_X = \delta^a_3|\bar{D}_X|$. This is easily achieved by a rotation in the 12 plane to rotate the $\bar{D}^a_X$-vector into the 23 plane and then a 23 plane rotation to make it point in the 3 direction :

$$\begin{aligned} O &= R_{23}[\theta_X].R_{12}[\frac{\pi}{2} - \varphi_X] \\ \theta_X &= ArcTan[\sqrt{\frac{V_1^2 + V_2^2}{V_3^2}}] \quad ; \qquad \varphi_X = ArcTan[\frac{V_2}{V_1}] \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

where $V^a = \bar{D}^a_X$. The potential for the flat directions from $\hat{S}'$ is now

$$\begin{aligned} V[\hat{S}'] &= m^2_{3/2}(|S'_0|^2 + |S'_+|^2 + |S'_{-1}|^2 + |S'_{+2}|^2 + |S'_{-2}|^2) \\ &\quad + \frac{g_f^2}{2}\{(|S'_+|^2 + 2|S'_{+2}|^2 - |S'_-|^2 - 2|S'_{-2}|^2 + (\bar{D}^3_X)')^2 \\ &\quad +2Tr(S'^\dagger[T_+, S'])Tr(S'^\dagger[T_-, S'])\} \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

This has a solution along the same lines as for the $N_g = 2$ case. Dropping primes one gets :

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{S}_{-2}| &= \sqrt{\frac{|\vec{D}_X|}{2} - \frac{m^2_{3/2}}{4g_f^2}} \\ \bar{S}_{-,+,+2} &= 0 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

IV. MASS SPECTRUM

The spectrum from the visible sector gauge interactions and superpotential is sensible by assumption and worked out for realistic cases in [26]. Our interest here is in the BM fields and-where relevant- their mixing with visible sector fields through gauge or supergravity terms. We shall confine ourselves to working out the leading contributions and ignore the effects of small shifts ($\bar{z}_i \to \bar{z}_i + \delta_i$, where δ_i of order $m_{3/2}$) in visible sector vevs which we assume (via the usual shift $\delta_i = -(W'')^{-1}_{ij}\bar{z}^j\kappa^2\overline{W}$) maintain $\mathcal{F}_{z_i} = 0$. We first consider the mass terms that arise in the globally supersymmetric Lagrangian when the fields $\phi_s, z_i, S_s, \hat{S}$ are replaced by their vevs. The supergravity corrections are necessarily suppressed by the Planck Length and are therefore important only if a field does not obtain a mass at one of the large scales present $\{M_P, M_{GUT}, \sqrt{M_P M_{3/2}}\} >> m_{3/2}$. At the global level vevs of F terms do not couple to fermion fields at all so that any Susy breaking contributions will be visible only in the scalar sector. Since only $F_{S_s} \neq 0$ it follows that it makes a susy breaking mass contribution of order $\bar{F}_{S_s} \sim m_{3/2}M_P$ to the scalars that it couples to in the cubic terms of the superpotential.

In the family gauge terms (we ignore the visible gauge sector under which the BM fields are singlets) the (global Susy preserving) $\hat{S}$ vevs mix the chiral fermion in the $\hat{S}$ multiplet with the visible sector chiral fermion combination that couples to the family gauginos to form a Dirac multiplet. Since $\hat{S}$ terms otherwise lack mass terms this leads to a residual massless fermion from the orthogonal mode. This is explained more explicitly below.

In the supergravity Lagrangian only fermion bilinears coupling with nonvanishing $\mathcal{F}$ terms can can possibly obtain mass terms sensitive to supersymmetry breaking. Only $\mathcal{F}_{S_s} \sim m_{3/2}M_{Planck}$ can be non zero at leading order although the $\mathcal{F}_{z_i,\hat{S}}$ will get smaller contributions of order $m_{3/2}M_{GUT}$

A. Mass spectrum for $N_g = 1$

In this case only gravity couples the visible and hidden sectors. The corrections to the visible sector are the familiar soft supersymmetry breaking supergravity corrections which are insensitive to the detailed form of the hidden sector superpotential or whether its Susy breaking minimum is local or global. The VEV $\bar{\phi}_s = -\mu_B/2\lambda_B$ implies that the field S_s

(which has no mass term $W = m_S S_s^2 + ..$) does not get a mass by mixing with ϕ_s and provides the Goldstino as expected, even though the Supersymmetry is broken by a local rather than global minimum. The fermion masses consist of the ϕ_s mode with mass $2\lambda_B \bar{S}_s$ and the gravitino with longitudinal mode from the goldstino $\tilde{S}_s$.

In the BM sector the *only* fermion mass terms at the global level are

$$-\mathcal{L} \;=\; \lambda_B \bar{S}_s \tilde{\phi}_s \tilde{\phi}_s = \frac{m_{\tilde{\phi}_s}}{2} \tilde{\phi}_s \tilde{\phi}_s \tag{34}$$

Mass terms due to the vev $\bar{\phi}_s$ cancel. The scalar mass spectrum consists of two real scalar modes from ϕ_s with masses squared $|2\lambda_B \bar{S}|^2 \pm |\mu_B|^2/2$ (notice the supersymmetry breaking splitting of the scalars from the chiral fermion's Majorana mass $2\lambda_B \bar{S}_s$) and two real scalars from S_s with masses squared $m_{3/2}^2((7+4\sqrt{3}) \pm (5+3\sqrt{3}))$. This completes the discussion of the $N_g = 1$ case apart from explicitly working out the effective theory which will be of the usual supergravity type (Global Susy GUT derived MSSM plus soft Susy breaking terms).

B. Mass spectrum for $N_g = 2$

Consider the masses of the superfields $\hat{\phi}_{ab}$. The fermions do not couple directly to the Susy violating F-term. Inserting the vevs in the fermion bilinear terms obtained from the superpotential in eqn.(26) we get the following fermion mass terms *only*(tildes here denote fermionic components)

$$-\mathcal{L} \;=\; \lambda_B \bar{S}_s (\tilde{\phi}_s \phi_s + 2\tilde{\phi}_+ \tilde{\phi}_-) + 2\lambda_B \tilde{\phi}_s \tilde{\phi}_{(-} \bar{S}_{+)} \tag{35}$$

Since $\bar{S}_s >> \bar{S}_\pm$ it is clear that the $\tilde{\phi}_s \tilde{\phi}_\pm$ mixing is far subdominant to the diagonal Majorana and Dirac mass terms $\tilde{\phi}_s^2, \tilde{\phi}_+ \tilde{\phi}_-$. Since there is no residual gauge group the chiral mass matrix is just $\overline{\partial_i \partial_j W}$. We have a symmetric 3×3 chiral mass matrix with rows and columns labelled by $\{\phi_s, \phi_+, \phi_-\}$:

$$m_{\phi\phi} \;=\; \lambda_B \overline{S}_s \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \epsilon & 0 \\ \epsilon & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{36}$$

where $\epsilon = \overline{S}_{-x}/\overline{S}_s \sim M_X/M_p$. This can easily be diagonalized and gives large masses in the GUT scale range for reasonable values $\lambda_B \sim 10^{-3}$ to 10^{-1}. In the scalar sector the ϕ fields

also receive mass-squared contributions from $\lambda_B F_{S_s} \sim \mu_B^2$ besides the contributions shown for the fermions. However since $|\mu_B| << M_X << M_p$ these will lead to small splitting of the dominant contributions shared with the fermions. All this is a straightforward extension of the behavior of the BM ϕ for $N_g = 1$.

With the VEVs given in Section 3 for $N_g = 2$ and due to the lack of any other mass term for $S_\pm$ it is easy to check that the fermionic component of S_{-x} mixes with the visible sector Higgsino field combination that combines to form a Dirac multiplet with the single family gaugino of the $O(2)$ gauge symmetry because the visible sector Higgs fields carry symmetric reppresentation of the family group. Thus the Dirac partner Λ for the $U(1)_f$ gaugino λ_f with Dirac mass

$$m_{\lambda_B} \;=\; \sqrt{2} g_f \sqrt{|\bar{S}_{-s}|^2 + \sum_i q_i^2 |\bar{z}_i|^2} \tag{37}$$

is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} \;&=\; -m_\lambda \Lambda \lambda_g + H.c. \\
\Lambda \;&=\; (\cos[\theta_S]\tilde{Z} - \sin[\theta_S]\tilde{S}_{-x}) \frac{\sqrt{2} g_f}{m_{\lambda_B}} \\
\tilde{Z} \;&=\; \frac{\sum_i q_i \bar{z}_i^* \tilde{z}_i}{\sqrt{\sum_i q_i^2 |\bar{z}_i|^2}} \\
\tan\theta_S \;&=\; \frac{x|\bar{S}_{-x}|}{\sqrt{\sum_i q_i^2 |\bar{z}_i|^2}}
\end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

However due to the absence of other mixing terms for $S_{\pm s}$ the orthogonal combination $\tilde{\chi}$ and S_x remain massless at leading order. Here

$$\tilde{\chi} \;=\; \cos[\theta_S]\tilde{S}_{-x} + \sin[\theta_S]\tilde{Z} \tag{39}$$

does not mix with the remaining massive modes since it is made of (SM neutral) zero modes $\tilde{S}_{-x}, \Lambda$ of the chiral mass matrices in the hidden and visible sectors respectively. Shifts due to supergravity are too small to shift the masses $m_{S_+\phi_-} = m_{\phi_+ S_-} = \mu_B + 2\lambda\bar{\phi}_s = 0$ appreciably. So the leading contributions come from loop effects(see Fig.1) (analogous to the one loop corrections to neutrino masses induced by soft susy breaking[30]) and have value

$$m_{\hat{S}}^{1-loop} \simeq \frac{|\lambda_B|^2}{16\pi^2} \frac{\bar{F}_S}{\bar{S}_s} \simeq \frac{|\lambda_B|^2}{16\pi^2} \frac{m_{3/2}}{\sqrt{3}-1} \tag{40}$$

Thus these masses may be as small as a few GeV even for large gravitino mass. Due to their weak interactions with light modes they may be suitable candidates for light Cold Dark matter. The scalar partners have masses



FIG. 1: Diagram for fermionic mass $m_{\tilde{S}}$

$$(m^2)_{S_x} \;=\; 2m_{3/2}^2 \quad ; \qquad m^2_{Re(S_{-x})} = 2g_f^2|D_X| - 2m_{3/2}^2 \tag{41}$$

Like $\tilde{S}_{-x}$ the hidden sector Goldstone scalar component $Im[S_{-x}]$ will again lead to a nearly massless mode since it too will mix with the $O(2)$ Goldstone contributions from the visible sector and hence the orthogonal mode (partner of the pseudo-Goldstino $\tilde{\chi}$) will be massless before loop effects. The scalar pseudo-Goldstone mode χ which remains massless even after symmetry breaking due to pseudo-doubling of goldstone modes(i.e independent breaking of the family symmetry in the potentials from the unlinked Hidden and visible sector superpotentials) can also obtain loop induced mass from the partner of the graph shown for the fermions, but it will remain light. This is because the supersymmetry breaking F term couples to other particles through ϕ_{ab} propagators whose large masses $\lambda_B < S_s > \sim M_X$ ensure that the effect of one loop corrections is a power of $F/M_X \sim m_{3/2}M_p/M_X$. It is clear that since all the other modes have large masses much greater than the gravitino mass and we have already taken into account the dominant contributions to the fields that participate in the Susy breaking, the supergravity corrections to their masses are sub-dominant and of no immediate significance to warrant their presentation here.

C. Mass spectrum for $N_g = 3$

The analysis for this case proceeds in a manner closely parallel to the case of two generations. Once again all contributions from the vev of ϕ_s cancel leaving for the BM fermion mass terms *only*

$$-\mathcal{L} \;=\; \lambda_B \bar{S}_s(\tilde{\phi}_s\tilde{\phi}_s + \tilde{\phi}_0\tilde{\phi}_0 + 2\tilde{\phi}_+\tilde{\phi}_- + 2\tilde{\phi}_{+2}\tilde{\phi}_{-2}) + 2\lambda_B\tilde{\phi}_s\tilde{\phi}_{+2}\bar{S}_{-2} \tag{42}$$

Once again we have diagonal Majorana/Dirac masses $2\lambda_B\bar{S}_s$ for all the components of ϕ and much smaller off diagonal contribution from the vev of the non-singlet $\hat{S}$. These will be accompanied by scalar masses of the same magnitude up to small splitting $O(m_{3/2})$. Similarly the scalars from the S_s multiplet will obtain masses of order the gravitino mass.

As for the $N_g = 2$ case fermionic partners of the $\hat{S}$ particles (except S_{-2} but even so the analog of $\tilde{\chi}$ will remain light via the mechanism explained for the $N_g = 2$ case) do not get mass to leading order. The Dirac partners of the family symmetry gauginos in the primed basis(where $\bar{D}^a \sim \delta^a_3$ are :

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda^3 \;&=\; \frac{-2\bar{S'}^\dagger_{-2}\tilde{S'}_{-2} + \sum_i q_i \bar{z}'^\dagger_i \tilde{z'}_i}{(4\overline{S'}^\dagger_{-2}\overline{S'}_{-2} + \sum_i \bar{q}_i^2 z'^*_i \bar{z'}_i)^{1/2}} \\
\Lambda^\pm \;&=\; \frac{\sum_i \bar{z}'^\dagger_i \mathcal{T}^\pm \tilde{z'}_i}{(\sum_i \bar{z}'^\dagger_i \mathcal{T}^+\mathcal{T}^- \bar{z'}_i)^{1/2}}
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

As before the fermion mode orthogonal to Λ^3 will remain massless along with $\widetilde{S}_{0,\pm,2}$.

The scalar masses are positive(apart from the Goldstone boson)

$$\begin{aligned}
M^2_{S_0} \;&=\; m^2_{3/2} \quad ; \qquad M^2_{S_-} = \frac{1}{2}m^2_{3/2} \\
M^2_{S_+} \;&=\; \frac{3}{2}m^2_{3/2} \quad ; \qquad M^2_{S_{+2}} = 2m^2_{3/2} \\
M^2_{R_{-2}} \;&=\; 4g_f^2|\frac{\vec{[}D_X|}{2} - 2m^2_{3/2} \quad ; \qquad M^2_{I_{-2}} = 0
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

In the above-since we are working in the primed basis- we have exhibited only the Goldstone longitudinal component of the $O(3)$ gauge boson in the 3 direction which comes from the field S_{-2} : of course all three $O(N_g)$ massive gauge bosons will get longitudinal mode contributions from the visible sector (which we assume breaks the family symmetry completely) which we have not discussed explicitly here (see however [26] for more details in a concrete model based on a realistic SO(10) GUT). Since only a linear combination of I_{-2} and a visible

sector massless mode will be eaten, we would again expect the orthogonal combination to remain massless.

Now we will have five light fermionic and one scalar degree of freedom lighter than the gravitino mass and with very weak couplings to ordinary matter. Again they will pick up mass at one loop due to supersymmetry breaking and will remain as the fossils of flavour and super symmetry breaking. Thus they are either candidates for multicomponent relic Dark matter or must be removed somehow.

From the above discussion, it is clear that the BM Susy breaking Minkowski vacuum is characterized by the presence of several light fields coming from the supersymmetry breaking (S_s) and from the $O(N_g)$ variant $\hat{S}$ fields over and above the usual MSSM light fields in the visible sector. The superfields (ϕ_{ab}) are superheavy with masses of order $\lambda_B \bar{S}_s \sim M_X$. The effective low energy theory must be written in terms of both sets of light fields by equating the heavy fields to their VEVs and separating the light fields out via an expansion in $m_{3/2}/M_p$. This calculation proceeds largely like that in [5] but care must be taken due to the additional gauge invariance active in both hidden and gauge sectors : the main effects of which the present analysis sought to clarify.

It bears mention that radiative effects in such systems may be quite significant and have an important bearing on cosmological behaviour[31]. The loop corrected Kahler potential is available up to two loops[32]. We will return to the study of the vacuum and cosmological predictions in the theory with both gravity and radiative effects in a sequel.

V. DISCUSSION

In this paper we have shown how, gravity mediation of Bajc-Melfo type calculable Supersymmetry breaking at metastable vacua in a hidden sector containing fields variant under a family gauge symmetry, ensures the viability of GUT and family symmetry breaking in the visible sector of a "Grand Yukawonification "[26] model. In such models one aims at generating the observed hierarchical fermion flavour structure from a gauged family symmetry model with only generation blind couplings. The special role of the BM supersymmetry breaking is that it provides flat directions in both the $O(N_g)$ singlet and the gauge variant parts of a symmetric chiral supermultiplet $S_{ab} = S_{ba}$. Since it is very difficult to make the contribution of the visible sector GUT fields to the $O(N_g)$ D-terms vanish, the $\hat{S}$ flat direc-

tion performs the invaluable function of cancelling this contribution *without disturbing the symmetry breaking in the visible sector*. The determination of the viability of the "Grand Yukawonification" model then becomes a matter of searching the relatively small remaining parameter space for viable parameter sets that fit the fermion data at M_X while taking account of threshold corrections at low and high scales and while respecting constraints on crucial quantities like the proton lifetime[20, 23, 25]. Note that in this approach not only are the hard parameters of the visible sector superpotential reduced by replacement of the flavoured parameters by bland family symmetric ones but also the soft supersymmetry breaking parameters are determined by the two parameters of the hidden sector superpotential and the Planck scale.

The structure used entails yet further stringent constraints since the masslessness of the moduli multiplets $\hat{S}_{ab}$ before supersymmetry breaking implies the existence of $N_g(N_g + 1)/2 - 1$ SM singlet fermions generically lighter than the gravitino mass scale and possibly as light as a few GeV. In addition the Polonyi mode S_s may also lead to difficulties in the cosmological scenario. Thus such modes can be both a boon and a curse for familion GUT models. A boon because generic Susy GUT models are hard put if asked to provide Susy WIMPs of mass below 100 GeV as CDM candidates as suggested by the DAMA/LIBRA experiment[28]. A curse because there are strong constraints on the existence of such light moduli which normally demand that their mass be rather large (> 10 TeV) due to the robust cosmological('Polonyi') problems arising from decoupled modes with Planck scale VEVs[29]. In contrast to the simple Polonyi model and String moduli, the BM moduli have explicit couplings to light fields through family D-term mixing and loops. Moreover the MSGUT scenario favours[23–25] large gravitino masses $> 5 - 50$ TeV. Thus the Polonyi and moduli problems may be evaded. In any case the cosmology need be considered seriously only after we have shown that the MSSM fermion spectrum is indeed generated by the "Yukawonified" NMSGUT[26].

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to Borut Bajc for numerous valuable discussions. I thank Charanjit K. Khosa for collaboration and Ila Garg for discussions and help with preparing the manuscript.

---

[1] E. Cremmer, S. Ferrara, L. Girardello and A. Van Proeyen, "Yang-Mills Theories with Local Supersymmetry: Lagrangian, Transformation Laws and SuperHiggs Effect," Nucl. Phys. B **212**, 413 (1983).

[2] N. Ohta, Prog. Theor. Phys. **70** (1983) 542.

[3] A. H. Chamseddine, R. L. Arnowitt and P. Nath, Phys. Rev. Lett. **49**, 970 (1982). History and exhaustive original referennces in : R. Arnowitt, A. H. Chamseddine and P. Nath, "The Development of Supergravity Grand Unification: Circa 1982-85," Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **27**, 1230028 (2012) [Erratum-ibid. A **27**, 1292009 (2012)] [arXiv:1206.3175 [physics.hist-ph]].

[4] S. Weinberg, "Does Gravitation Resolve the Ambiguity Among Supersymmetry Vacua?," Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1776 (1982).

[5] L. J. Hall, J. D. Lykken and S. Weinberg, "Supergravity as the Messenger of Supersymmetry Breaking," Phys. Rev. D **27** (1983) 2359.

[6] J. Polony, Budapest preprint KFKI-1977-93 (1977), unpublished.

[7] L. O'Raifeartaigh, Nucl. Phys. **B96** (1975) 331-352

[8] S. Dimopoulos, G. R. Dvali, R. Rattazzi and G. F. Giudice, "Dynamical soft terms with unbroken supersymmetry," Nucl. Phys. B **510** (1998) 12 [arXiv:hep-ph/9705307].

[9] K. Intriligator, N. Seiberg and D. Shih, "Dynamical SUSY breaking in meta-stable vacua," JHEP **0604** (2006) 021 [arXiv:hep-th/0602239].

[10] M. A. Luty, "Simple gauge-mediated models with local minima," Phys. Lett. B **414** (1997) 71 [arXiv:hep-ph/9706554]; K. Agashe, "GUT and SUSY breaking by the same field," Phys. Lett. B **444** (1998) 61 [arXiv:hep-ph/9809421]. K. Agashe, "Improved GUT and SUSY breaking by the same field," Nucl. Phys. B **588** (2000) 39 [arXiv:hep-ph/0003236].

[11] B. Bajc and A. Melfo, "Metastable gauged O'Raifeartaigh," JHEP **0804**, 062 (2008) [arXiv:0801.4349 [hep-ph]].

[12] S. Ray, "Some properties of meta-stable supersymmetry-breaking vacua in Wess-Zumino Phys.

Lett. B **642** (2006) 137 [arXiv:hep-th/0607172].

[13] E. Witten, "Mass Hierarchies In Supersymmetric Theories," Phys. Lett. B **105** (1981) 267.

[14] B. A. Ovrut and S. Raby, "The Geometrical Hierarchy Model and $N = 1$ Supergravity," Phys. Lett. B **125**, 270 (1983).

[15] C. S. Aulakh, "Local Supersymmetry And Hi-lo Scale Induction," CCNY-HEP-83/2; C. S. Aulakh, "Intermediate Mass Scales In Supersymmetric Gauge Theories," PhD Thesis, CCNY, 1983, UMI-84-01477 ; http://physics.puchd.ac.in/aulakh/PhDthesis.

[16] C. S. Aulakh and R. N. Mohapatra,CCNY-HEP-82-4 April 1982, CCNY-HEP-82-4-REV, "Implications of Supersymmetric SO(10) Grand Unification," Phys. Rev. D **28**, 217 (1983).

[17] T.E. Clark, T.K.Kuo, and N.Nakagawa, An SO(10) supersymmetric grand unified theory", Phys. lett. **115B**, 26(1982).

[18] C.S. Aulakh, B. Bajc, A. Melfo, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, " The minimal supersymmetric grand unified theory ", Phys. Lett. B **588**, 196 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0306242].

[19] B. Bajc, A. Melfo, G. Senjanovic and F. Vissani, "The minimal supersymmetric grand unified theory. I: Symmetry breaking and Phys. Rev. D **70**, 035007 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0402122];

[20] C.S. Aulakh and A. Girdhar, "SO(10) MSGUT: Spectra, couplings and threshold effects ", Nucl. Phys. B **711**, 275 (2005).

[21] C.S. Aulakh, "From germ to bloom ", arXiv:hep-ph/0506291.

[22] C.S. Aulakh and S. K. Garg, "MSGUT: From bloom to doom ", Nucl. Phys. B **757**, 47 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0512224].

[23] C.S. Aulakh and S. K. Garg,"The New Minimal Supersymmetric GUT : Spectra, RG analysis and Fermion Fits, Nucl. Phys.**B**857 (2012)101, arXiv:0807.0917v3.

[24] C.S. Aulakh , "NMSGUT III : Grand Unification Upended ", arXiv:hep-ph/1107.2963.

[25] C. S. Aulakh, I. Garg and C. K. Khosa, "Baryon Stability on the Higgs Dissolution Edge : Threshold corrections and suppression of Baryon violation in the NMSGUT," Nucl. Phys. B **882**, 397 (2014) [arXiv:1311.6100 [hep-ph]].

[26] C. S. Aulakh and C. K. Khosa, "SO(10) grand unified theories with dynamical Yukawa couplings," Phys. Rev. D **90**, no. 4, 045008 (2014) [arXiv:1308.5665 [hep-ph]].

[27] C.S.Aulakh and A. Girdhar, "SO(10) a la Pati-Salam ", Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **20**, 865 (2005)

[28] R. Bernabei, P. Belli, S. d'Angelo, A. Di Marco, F. Montecchia, F. Cappella, A. d'Angelo and A. Incicchitti *et al.*, "Dark Matter investigation by DAMA at Gran Sasso," Int. J. Mod. Phys.

A **28**, 1330022 (2013) [arXiv:1306.1411 [astro-ph.GA]].

[29] G. D. Coughlan, W. Fischler, E. W. Kolb, S. Raby and G. G. Ross, "Cosmological Problems for the Polonyi Potential," Phys. Lett. B **131** (1983) 59; B. de Carlos, J. A. Casas, F. Quevedo and E. Roulet, "Model independent properties and cosmological implications of the dilaton and moduli sectors of 4-d strings," Phys. Lett. B **318** (1993) 447 [hep-ph/9308325].

[30] C. S. Aulakh and R. N. Mohapatra, "Supersymmetry and the Calculation of Neutrino Masses," Phys. Lett. B **121**, 147 (1983).

[31] M. Dine, W. Fischler and D. Nemeschansky, Phys. lett. 136B(1984)169.

[32] For two loop results and an references to earlier one loop results see S. Groot Nibbelink and T. S. Nyawelo, "Two Loop effective Kahler potential of (non-)renormalizable supersymmetric models," JHEP **0601** (2006) 034 [hep-th/0511004].